III. REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 16 and 20 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected or objected to claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, clams 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lei *et al*. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,552), hereafter "Lei." Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lei. Claims 2, 8-10, 12-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Lei in view of Singhai (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,022), hereafter "Singhai."

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of July 18, 2007, with their representative, Hunter E. Webb. No proposed amendment was submitted in advance of the interview. In the interview, Applicants' representative pointed out that the limitation of allowing analysis based on the confidential details of the data was in fact claimed in the previous amendment. The Office agreed with Applicants' representative on this point. In addition, Applicants' representative discussed features of the claimed invention that Applicant asserts are not disclosed by Lei, including those features included in the above claims as amended. The Examiner agreed with Applicant that addition of a requester in both the exclusion and composite analysis portions of the claim would serve to distinguish the claimed invention from Lei.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 20 and 22-24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection over Lei, Applicants respectfully submit that Lei fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to newly amended independent claims 1, 12, 16 and 20, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest concealing confidential details in received data from a requester while allowing a composite analysis to be performed by the requester that is based on the confidential details. This amendment is supported, for example, in page 12, line 15 through page 13, line 11 of the original specification. In contrast, the passage of Lei cited by the Office describes using views to do row-level filtering of data to enforce an access control policy. To this extent, Lei allows certain data to be displayed while other data is not. However, Lei does not disclose the ability to perform a composite analysis based on the non-displayed data by the same requester from which the data itself is not displayed.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes "…concealing confidential details in received data from a requester while allowing a composite analysis to be performed by the requester that is based on the confidential details." Claim 1. As such, the concealing of the confidential details in received data from the requester of the claimed invention does not also prohibit analysis by the requester that is based on the confidential details as do the views of Lei. Thus, the concealing of confidential details as included in the claimed invention is not taught by the use of views for row-level access-control policy of Lei. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Lei also fails to teach "a data update system for periodically automatically examining stored data to

identify and expose any confidential details that have become non-confidential details", as in claim 1. In support of its contention to the contrary, the Office cites an extensive passage of Lei that describes its defining and setting of context attributes. These context attributes help define how a database server should respond to a query. Col. 8, lines 39-44. To this extent, it is not the data itself that effected by a change in the attributes. Accordingly, nowhere in the passage of Lei cited by the Office is the status of data that is confidential data changed to non-confidential. In view of the foregoing, Lei does not disclose the type of data confidentiality system and data update system that is found in the current invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIM 2, 5, 8-10, 12-19 and 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the Office's arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

Serial No. 09/988,320

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: September 10, 2007

_____
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew

Serial No. 09/988,320